

Thank you, Mr. President. That final time I will use that expression. I wish you well.

Right. I'm inexperienced at this. Okay, then, is it coming through? Good.

Well, I think what we should say first is congratulations to all of you that made it here tonight, given the kind of weather that you have. It surely is a miserable night. I've been told back – down here every time I come to St. Louis the weather is lousy, that I brought it with me, that you never have it like this except when I'm here. Frankly I don't believe that, 'cause I hear it in every other city I go to as well. One thing that is consistent, however, that's the kind of friendship and warmth and fraternalism that I do experience each time I come to St. Louis.

And as you know, I've come into this city in your best times and perhaps in your worst times, certainly in some most difficult times. I've been here to swear in the new officers, as is the case tonight, and here during bargaining sessions and here during strikes and here during conferences and conventions, social functions. And given the fact that we have over 100,000 members and something in the order of 200 local unions, For what it's worth, and I'm not sure what it means, I do not get into every local union as often. Perhaps the other local unions feel better about that, but the truth of the matter is that I have for many, many years, a deep and abiding sense of identification with this local, which only comes through the association I've had with the members of the local, and the officers in particular, 'cause I've worked so closely with them. We've disagreed, we've argued, we've worked together, we've worked across purposes, but through it all I suppose that's really the meaning of our organization, or any organization that has any vitality we're identifying.

My own schedule, as is usually the case, is quite busy. I'll be leaving for a distressing visit tomorrow – trip tomorrow. I'm off to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to attend a funeral of Ted Myers, president of Pittsburgh Local for 29 years. Ted and I sort of grew up together in the organization. He suffered a heart attack on Sunday night and we were all saddened by the passing, because he represented, to those of us who have been around for quite a while, the sort of continuity through the old Amalgamated Lithographers, which is the organization that I was a member of, and then the LPIU, and the GAIU. In fact, I was in Pittsburgh about six weeks ago, attending their local meeting and having dinner with their officers. I was greatly distressed to learn of Ted's passing on Sunday night. I'm sure serving among the officers here many know him and have met him at conventions and share our sense of loss.

After Pittsburgh I go onto Washington briefly, and Sunday then onto Toronto. Then out to Vancouver on Monday. I must say that I deserve criticism for my scheduling; this is a hell of a time of the year to be heading up into the North Country, back to Washington on Wednesday. I mention those cities only by way of indicating that on an evening such as this, where we're swearing in the new officers of the local union it's an important occasion that marks the end, but it also marks the beginning. What it says, however, most of all, is that it is continuity. Continuity in the sense that the union itself is the issue. The union itself is the meaning. The union itself is where it's at, to borrow the current jargon.

And our role as individuals then is to make a contribution towards the continuity, the strengthening, and the wellbeing of those who belong to the organization. Whether it's my travel schedule to a lot of other cities, whatever the issues, or whether it's your work here in St. Louis as an officer in whatever role. We have as a basis a common effort and interest, the continuity of the organization, the wellbeing of the members who belong to the organization.

It's interesting to note as well that we are celebrating this year our 100th year as an organization. 1882, when the first of our organizations was founded. At the international convention we had in Detroit a few months ago I showed some slides to the \_\_\_\_\_. In fact, in some cases they were photographs, some cases drawings of life in this country and in Canada 100 years ago. And I was struck, as I'm sure the delegates were, by the fact that it was comparatively primitive in a physical sense if we were just then struggling with some of the Indian chiefs, to put them on reservations and bring about an opportunity for the development in the West, and at the same time completing the building of the Brooklyn Bridge, but had already begun to see the emergence of some of the real problems in our society. The beginnings of the sweatshops had emerged in the New York and in Chicago.

And as you examine the history of that period it's remarkable how similar are the issues. It may be that they have some different name or title, it may be that the barricade was a little higher, it may be that it came under the heading of their subsistence, but from the point of view of the union it was still the same issue fundamentally, the issue of demanding full and rightful sharing of the benefits of our society for those who are working people in our society, who belong to our union or other unions. And so things really do not change too much. In fact, the more they change the more they really remain the same.

What is significant, and my reason for mentioning our 100th year, is that the ceremony that we go through here tonight is a reflection of the trade union tradition that has gained a place in our organization for 100 years, and one that needs to be guarded and preserved. With it is trade union discipline. No socioeconomic organization, such as is the case with the union, can sustain and maintain itself without a proper discipline, fairly administered, properly understood, but administered nevertheless. And that there be within that as well trade union democracy. These three things together, which have been practiced in our organization for 100 years, indeed will be practiced, I'm sure, long after all of us are gone. Trade union tradition, trade union discipline, trade union democracy are the hallmarks of the Graphic Arts International Union, and it's in that respect that we have our prime obligation as officers of an organization we install here tonight.

With respect to the specifics about the current issues and problems and successes and difficulties confronting us, there's a long list and I could spend a good deal of time detailing them for you. Suffice to say that our fortune hangs to a great extent as members of this union in the wellbeing of the particular industry that we work in. While it's true that the union itself is an entity separated apart from the industry, it's not an entity wholly independent of the industry. As the industry goes so goes the wellbeing. Of those who

work in the industry, so goes the wellbeing of those who belong to this union. We can influence the events and make decisions which will, in a fashion, adjust the end result of our efforts, but not radically alter the fundamental course of events, even though we make our decisions as a union, and as union people separate and apart from the industry.

The point I'm making is that whenever you want to examine our current situation, our current status, our prospects for the immediate future, one needs to take a look at the industry itself. In that respect, as you well know, it's an industry undergoing radical change. It may be that other industries are undergoing similar change. Indeed, as we read in the papers about remarkable technological change that's occurring in so many industries our tendency is to think that it's not so with us, or that we are being somewhat less impacted.

The truth of the matter is that our industry is undergoing radical change from top to bottom. Whether you're talking about the ownership of the industry or method of producing the products of our industry, the skills that we contribute or the technical knowledge that we require, the location of the industry, the financing of the industry, the government's supervision of the industry, or lack of supervision of the industry, whatever the aspect, indeed rapid and dramatic and radical change is the order of the day.

Examples of that can be cited without too much difficulty. I was fascinated, however, to read in the latest edition of one of the trade publications, talking about the advent of flexible systems, whatever the hell that means. In a highly technical learned presentation in the *American Printer* the remarks and conclusion I thought struck home. Two points they make. One is that the investment in equipment for the commercial printing market dictates new investments when they happen will probably be in scanners, and that's because more and more plants will do color separation by scanner, which means that the indirect method, or even the direct screening method will disappear within the next five years, to be replaced no doubt by scanner technologies. I'm not focusing on scanners really; I'm focusing on the projections of the impact of radical change with respect to traditional methods of production in the industry.

It doesn't matter what trade publication you pick up, the same point comes through. It doesn't matter whether you're talking about scanners or whether you're talking about a binder, or whether you're talking about classes for that matter. Change, and radical change is the order of the day. The cornerstone that we're hanging onto is the method of putting ink on paper. So long as that remains traditional in the sense that we've understood it in the past, then that radical change will be moderated. But the latest projects would indicate that the only thing holding the traditional method of putting ink on paper in the printing and publishing industry is the investment in dollars that companies already have, and the current equipment that they currently have. By way of saying that with the reorganization of the ownership, the reorganization of the financing of the industry, I suspect that we're going to be confronted with more and more and more change.

Interesting comment they make at the end of the article talking about the answer to our problem. They say that improved management is certainly one of the answers. Avoiding waste is another. \_\_\_\_\_. And the third consideration is that many operators really don't know how to operate their equipment, so say these experts. And you can't afford to train people on a continuing basis, so say these experts. The answer is equipment with electronic controls that will take the operator step by step through the process.

You know what they're saying there, of course? They're saying that we will, by virtue of new investment in equipment with dramatic electronic controls, take you through the process of production without your having to make the contribution in terms of technical knowledge or skill that you currently make. I hope from that particular article, which is the December '81 edition of *American Printer*, by way of indicating to you the attitude that is current within the industry – increasingly current within the industry.

As a matter of fact, if you look at the jargon used by the corporations today there's a tendency to refer to companies in the Old West attitude; they refer to companies with a heavy cash flow and cash reserves as a "cash cow," to be milked presumably. They refer to the corporate industrial relations people as "hired guns." There's this almost reverting to the old notion that it's everyone for themselves and we're back to the Old West days when we're plunging in to stick with it, to milk the cash cow of whatever it will give. No talk about the contribution of those employees who work in the plant, no talk about the wellbeing of those employees and how can this entity best return to the interests of the corporation.

Fortunately this is not totally the case. Fortunately it's not applying in every single company in an immediate sense. But it's important that we dramatize the increasing attitude of the multi-plant corporate ownership within this industry, which depersonalizes the industry with all of its corresponding implications with respect to bargaining and indeed the progress of individuals who work in the plants and belong to this particular union. It's especially important to note that kind of thing today, when we're working against the background of an economic downturn, which is a polite and kind way of describing what the hell they've done in the White House recently.

Have you seen the latest figures? 8.9-percent unemployed on a national basis. Have you seen the latest proposal for cutting the – solving the budget problem by cutting the social programs even further? I would suggest to you that the exercise that we're going through today with regard to social programs is not really important. It isn't really important. The fact that they're proposing to reduce social security for some participants, or the fact that they're cutting down on Medicaid or Medicare isn't really important. Sounds \_\_\_\_\_. You know what's important? Their objective is to eliminate most of the social programs that have been developed in this country over the years. Mark those words. Their objective is to eliminate them.

We spend a lot of time working on the political and legislative front in Washington, and those people who are ideologically committed to the kind of ideas that are coming out of the White House today do not have simply cuts in mind; they have elimination of these

programs in mind. And I'm highly amused when I read about their deciding that they need to identify some welfare queen who drives a Cadillac and is drawing social security and is also getting food stamps and is also on some subsidized housing program. I'm highly amused when they identify those types of people, and thus make that the base for cutting out an enormously important social program that has been virtually essential to the income redistribution that we've had during the last 35 years in this country.

I do not want really to spend too much time analyzing that, except to convey to you that the moment of truth on this question will be coming up in November of this year, which is the midterm elections. And I mention that to you now because I was a party to the enormous solidarity \_\_\_\_\_ rally we had in Washington, where there were 350,000 people marched. This union was there and well represented. And that rally and all that it meant will go for naught unless in November of this year we examine carefully the record of those congressmen who are representing us in Washington and who have been hiding behind the notion that we need to balance the budget. Well, balancing the budget apparently is going to result in another \$140 billion deficit for the first time in our history. And these congressmen need to be required to be counted.

I think that November may well be the turning point if we're awake. I've been attending a great number of meetings, and there's an increasing sense of concern about the fact that we're moving back to the '20s, back to the cowboy atmosphere, back to the good old days when it was every person for themselves. But we do not have any belief at all that the value of a society, the value of a country that best be measured by how well they look after those least able to look after themselves. The businessman will take care of himself in any case. Those who belong to unions will probably be able to take care of themselves. But the worth of a society is best measured by how we look after those least able to look after themselves.

Those lofty, lofty terms I should bring you down to earth and talk about what's happening directly in our organization. Most of you I believe are members of the – participants of the early retirement pension program. We have a meeting in February, coming up, in which we will be approving benefits again. I'm happy to be able to report that \_\_\_\_\_ continues on a very sound basis, actually sound in every respect. We have a surplus this year as reported by the actuary, and we'll be designing new benefits in all probability primarily in what's referred to as the basic benefit. So for those who have managed to achieve any respectable level of age, as they say, if you're in your late 50s, early 60s, you're going to expect that that plan will continue to serve you, and more so than ever as a result of these new improvements. Coupled with your pension plan, it begins to make some sense in providing the kind of money that you need to retire with some decent income.

It's worth thinking about the fact that social security is in jeopardy. If this administration is in long enough it may be removed. And the philosophy of this particular administration is that the private sector should carry the cost, and not the public sector. Well, as you head into bargaining this year, and you will be heading into bargaining this year, remember that when you're talking with the employers, that this administration is saying

that there need not be a social programs paid out of the public purse, that the private sector can and should pay for social programs. That's health and welfare, that's pension for this particular organization. And it is not enough to hold what you currently have; you're going to have to improve it not only for active workers, but for retired workers. Because the publicly supported segment of these social programs undoubtedly will be moderated or removed within the next three years by this administration. So you have a target for bartering we'd rather not have, but that's going to be thrust upon you.

The hottest meetings that we have with GAIU around the country fall into two categories: technological change and its impact upon our numbers. And the second is pre-retirement seminar, where the members are brought into meetings who have reached age 55, for discussion about the decisions that they may make with respect to retirement in the next five years. Those are the best attended meetings of any. Best. Let me tell you, they call meetings in which 200 or 300 people are invited, and 200 or 300 people turn up.

I was in a meeting at a local union a month and a half ago, and if I recall correctly the figures, they had invited from this particular local union I think 250 people who were members of the local, who had reached age 55, and there were 240 attended the meeting on a Saturday within their own time, to discuss their possibility of retirement. So too is it true of meetings with respect to technological development. And that kind of awkward phrase, "technological development," really means what's going to happen to you with respect to job security, looking out ahead in the next five years. And it doesn't matter if you work in a standard department, camera department, a press room, or a line \_\_\_\_\_ or wherever. The impact is across the board, and our members evidently are sensitive to it, and we have enormous attendance at those kinds of meetings.

I believe you would be wise, if you've not already done so, to plan those kinds of meetings here in your local union. I am satisfied that if you do you will be serving your members well and serving the industry well, because the introduction of technological development should not be wrapped in a sense of fear provided as an organization. We can bargain the moderation of its impact and hopefully it turns to preserving job security. But in the best sense it determines about capturing the maximum on what comes from an increase in productivity.

We also have – we had in 1982 some 40-percent of our members coming up for negotiation. If you read the papers, and I'm sure you do, about the current crisis in the economy, and as they translate that to unions, what they say is it's a time of give-backs. You're reading this every day; the auto workers are confronted with the possibility of Chrysler going under, with Ford being as bad off as is Chrysler. And the question that's being posed by so many today is, "What is the union" – meaning the members – "going to give back?"

This in part is a bit of psychological warfare, 'cause in our industry they have thousands upon thousands of companies. Some are strong, some are weak, most are in between. The projections against - again in this article, is that they expect 1982, for the **broader** parts industry to be strong and to be healthy. I would only suggest to you that if the word

"give-backs" is used either by the employer or by the members or arises in bargaining, just remember that you bargain it up on a long and difficult process, and you should bargain down if you have to. By that same concept, not everything is of equal value in a contract. It took a long time to get the 35-hour workweek. It took a long time to get good health and welfare programs, and a long time to get good pension programs. They do not equate with a \$5.00 a week increase. A \$5.00 a week increase comes to you through bargaining, primarily if the industry is healthy enough to afford it. The achievement of shorter workweek, of job security provisions, of social programs such as pensions and health and welfare, come about to hard bargaining over a period of years.

Should there be talk of give-backs one would need to examine very carefully, A, the health of the company that was talking about it, and B, the kind of issues they're talking about in the give-backs. We shouldn't get caught up in this emotional phase that is current because of the downturn in the economy if indeed the companies we work for and the members we represent are healthy enough to either maintain and sustain what they currently have, or we go forward. I want not to have you caught up in any kind of stampede that should be translated primarily by the employer into \_\_\_\_\_ to give away that which we've fought so hard and so long to achieve. That does not mean that we won't examine with care the bargaining situation in those companies where their competitive situation or their own economic situation has gotten into such severe straights as to threaten the very jobs of the people in our local. We will examine that, but we will not do so if it's to the sole purpose of subsidizing bad management. And so often that is the case.

We'd had an international referendum recently circulated throughout organization from the convention, and there were 15 issues in that proposition. I don't know whether you had the report yet from our office \_\_\_\_\_, but every one of those issues was approved by our membership. Rather interesting, because they involved adjustments in structure. In some cases they involved changes in the financial arrangements, constitutional changes, creation of a new educational department, reinforcement of our organizing approach. And every one of them was approved by the membership by referendum vote. I'm not sure and I would have to struggle to recall when we ever submitted a total package to the membership for a referendum vote in every city throughout the US and Canada and had them all approved. One must ask yourself whether there is an awakening occurring with respect to the concern of our membership as to the role the union probably will play and play over the course of the next couple of years in very wellbeing. I hope that my construction and analysis of that is true.

In any case, while there are legislative questions, political questions, bargaining questions, productivity issues, job security questions, all of these are a part of the agenda, if you like, on the plate of arguing, we're working as well to move – to restructure our organization so to best address ourselves to that.

I have been meeting within the past few months with the leadership of the Printing Pressman's Union. Our own organization, as you know, has for the last 20 years led the way with respect to mergers, led the way with respect to restructuring arguing so as to replace the loss that individuals feel with respect to the change and the steel content of

our job and replace that with organizational strengths within the organization of the union that we belong to. Such was the reason it led to our merger between the \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. Such was the reasoning that led to our merger with the bookbinders. And that's the very reason that is leading us to discussions with the Printing Pressman's Union.

I expect to announce formally within the next perhaps three weeks that we will commence formal merger discussions with the Pressman's Union. I'm not prepared at this point to indicate to you whether there is some timetable ahead that will ensure that we will achieve merger on the international level six months or eight months or whatever. I did want to indicate to you, however, that the meetings I've held to this point have been designed to address ourselves to the most difficult problems confronting us in any merger, and they are difficult to achieve. And I could say that to you and speak with some experience, having gone through two mergers myself.

We are addressing ourselves to the most difficult problem so as to hopefully achieve a merger and thus bring about that final total reorganization of those who are employed within the graphic arts industry so as to have them at some point in time members of one union. But the graphical union is also very interested in merger; I had meetings with the president of that organization during the AFL convention in New York a month and a half ago. The newspaper guild continues to philosophically to express its continued interest in aligning itself with the Graphic Arts Union. A point I want to make with you is that we're the focal point, we're the ones that can make it happen. We're the ones that if it is going to happen we'll be primarily responsible for it, and we're satisfied that its value and its correctness is total. Doesn't solve all the problems, as you surely know within this city, but it puts you in the best position to address yourself to the problems.

So to then do I address myself on a continuing ongoing basis to the organization's problems if on a somewhat larger basis nevertheless, equally important to you here in St. Louis as in all of the other cities. I continue to be optimistic, I continue to believe that our single-greatest weakness is not our ability to know and understand what must be done as an organization for our own members and with our own members, but whether we can do it in time. Time is the question.

The labor movement itself has durability beyond question. Our 100 years of history proves that. And despite the suggestions by some people that we're declining and dying, that's pure nonsense. Our biggest problem, I repeat, is not whether we can solve our problems, but whether we can do it in a timely fashion. And so then as we enter into the swearing in ceremony, the tradition here in St. Louis, of setting objectives and responsibilities of the new officer corps, I say to you that we're not able to afford the luxury of riding through the next period with a guarantee that all will be well, but that our special responsibilities require that we intensify our efforts more than ever.

And on that note I would like to proceed with the swearing in ceremony. Thank you.

I have an assistant installing officer I would imagine, and at this moment what I'd like to do is read the names of the newly elected officers, who I believe are in the front rows,



and then we will have each of the respective responsible groups, sergeant-at-arms, local board of trustees, executive board, and the individual officers brought up to the platform for their charge and responsibility individually.

First let me read all of the names. The sergeant-at-arms: Vincent Duplais, Louis Hanson, Bill Hook, John Zander. The local board of trustees: Laurence Fuller, Donald Eckton, Russell Parker. Executive board members: Bill Steveher, Joseph Fomberg, Laurence Anderson, Henry Seger, Charles Rothweiler, Edwin Workman, John Warmbull, Ken McKaren, Daniel Terry, Jerry Grisham, Patrick Jarfee, Dave Bowman. Vice President A, Shirley Leaker. Vice President B, Treasurer Jim Timberlin. Vice President C, Recording Secretary Bob Kimmler. Executive Vice President: William McCarthy. And President: Charles Witt.

Now could I have – would the sergeant-at-arms bring to the platform – excuse me, would the sergeant-at-arms come to the platform? Vincent Duplais, Louis Hanson, Bill Hook, and John Zander. Come right up. Why not?

The sergeant-at-arms shall escort all guests and/or visitors to the platform. You shall perform such other duties at meetings as may be requested by the presiding officer, and will enforce order and be keeper of the door at all regular and special meetings. In addition to this, you shall assist in keeping attendance records of the meeting. I am always compelled to note that the duties I suppose 100 years ago of the sergeant-at-arms would be to keep the police out, since these meetings were then considered a conspiracy against the law. But your duties are somewhat more ceremonial, they're nonetheless equally important. Congratulations.

The local board of trustees. Laurence Fuller, Donald Eckton, Russell Parker, would you come up, please?

The local board of trustees shall be responsible for examining the financial condition of the local and ascertain that its expenditures have been made in accordance with the bylaws of the local. You shall meet monthly for these examinations and then shall advise the president and the executive board of your findings in writing. And again, I'm compelled to comment that the matter of financial affairs in a union is one that there's a whole vast array of people waiting in the wings to find us wanting in some slight sense. And surely the matter of financial affairs is the area in which we're most vulnerable. Your responsibilities are considerable and I commend it to your duty. Congratulations.

The executive board members, and I understand – well, there are quite a number of them. If you wouldn't mind lining up in front here. The executive board members are as follows: Larry Anderson, Dave Bowman, Joe Fomberg, Jerry Grisham, Ken McKaren, Charles Rothweiler, Henry Seger, Bill Steveher, Patrick Jarfee, Daniel Terry, John Warmbull, Edwin Workman.

Brothers, it will be your duty to govern and respect the matters of policy, the funds, properties, and financial affairs of the local. You shall rule in respect to the application

and interpretation of the bylaws, develop, make, and implement policies for the furtherance of the objectives of the local. Hear and determine all charges brought against the members. The success of this local depends largely on the ability and devotion to duty of this board, both individually and collectively. You are the organization between me; your decision on all questions coming before you should be of such weight that your wisdom, except possibly in rare instance, cannot be questioned. Congratulations.

Vice President A, Shirley Leaker, come to the platform please. Since you're vice president your duties according to the local bylaws are not specifically spelled out because they will be variable in the minute. You shall perform such duties as may be assigned to you by the president, and fulfill them to the best of your ability. Your duties are therefore of an assistant's nature in helping the president carry on the business of the local and carry out the policies of the local. Congratulations.

*[End of Audio]*